



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/622,392

07/17/2003

Daryn Kiely

IGT1P097/P-826

4668

22434

7590

12/01/2006

BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP

P.O. BOX 70250

OAKLAND, CA 94612-0250

EXAMINER

DIEP, NHON THANH

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2621

DATE MAILED: 12/01/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/622,392

Applicant(s)

KIELY ET AL.

Examiner

Nhon T. Diep

Art Unit

2621

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 February 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 17 July 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 1/31/2005 12/22/03

- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

2. Claims 1, 5-12, 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Assayag et al (US 2003/0103138 A1), cited by the applicants.

Assayag et al discloses a video security and control system comprising the same computer-implemented method of controlling a camera to capture security-related events, the method comprising: (a) determining whether a security-related event has occurred or is occurring at one or more locations in or near a surveyed area (paragraph 0038); and (b) automatically activating said camera in response to a positive determination that a security-related event has occurred or is occurring at a particular location in order to capture video information at said particular location (paragraph 0039) as specified in claims 1, 12 and 18-19; further comprising the step of determining which of a plurality of available cameras should capture video information (fig. 3, one of DSP camera 1,... DSP camera N, Dome camera 1, ... Dome camera 3 will capture image as initiated by appropriate "Door contact") as specified in claims 5 and 18; further comprising the step of automatically directing and focusing said camera to capture

Art Unit: 2621

video information at said particular location (paragraph 0040) as specified in claims 6 and 18; further comprising the step of capturing a digital video clip of said security-related event (paragraphs 0039, 0040) as specified in claims 7, 12 and 18; further comprising the step of storing data characterizing the security-related event in a database (paragraphs 0030, 0055) as specified in claims 8, 15 and 18; wherein at least a portion of the data stored within said database is organized by security-related events (paragraphs 0014, 0020 Video motion detection triggers the storing) as specified in claims 9, 16 and 20; further comprising the step of automatically associating said digital video clip with one or more data identifiers characterizing said security-related event (paragraphs 0019, 0023, 0024, 0027, 0029) as specified in claims 10 and 17; wherein said one or more data identifiers comprise at least one or more items selected from the group consisting of: the type or types of security-related event, a time of the security-related event, a date of the security-related event, a location of the security-related event, the camera or cameras capturing video information of the security-related event, data card insertion information, meter information, manual operator information, and one or more arbitrary identifiers that can be cross referenced or catalogued (paragraph 0019, full-face identifiable face images are stored) as specified in claim 11.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 2-4, 13-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Assayag et al, in view of Berg et al (US 7,048,630).

As applied to claims 1 above, it is noted that Assayag et al further the security-related event comprises an event selected from the group consisting of: a manually triggered alarm such as a fire alarm or security hot button, irregular use of a smart card, electronic funds transfers in excess of a threshold amount, credit requests or use in excess of a threshold amount, a substantial matching of a patron to a catalogued suspect by a facial recognition system, a gaming machine slot door open, a gaming machine drop door open, a gaming machine fill door open, a gaming machine panel open, a loss of network communication to a gaming machine, irregular gaming machine to network communications, a substantially large jackpot hit, and an irregular or frequent plurality of jackpot hits from one gaming machine or a group of gaming machines (paragraphs 0019, 0023, 0024, 0027, 0029) as specified in claim 14. However, Assayag et al does not particularly disclose: the security-related events occur in or around a gaming establishment as specified in claims 2, 13; the camera is located in a gaming machine at or near where said security-related event took place as specified in claim 3; and the camera is located in a position above multiple gaming machines in the gaming establishment as specified in claim 4.

With regard to claims 2-3 and 13, berg et al teaches the "the video camera captures an image within the field of view of the lens of the video camera, which would usually include the head and face of a player who plays the machine. Instead of the image being captured on photographic film, the image is captured through an electronic

Art Unit: 2621

sensor board. The images captured on the electronic sensor board may be selectively used for a variety of purposes, including verification of the identity of a player with a player tracking card used by the player of the machine and including security purposes. In the preferred embodiment, the video camera is used to capture a player's image on selected occasions during the player's play of the casino game on the machine.". And therefore, having these two references in front of him/her, one ordinary skilled level in the art at the time the invention was made would have found it obvious to combine and in the process to provide a camera-security system for determining security related event occur in or around a gaming establishment, and wherein the camera is located in a gaming machine at or near where said security-related event took place as taught by Berg et al. Doing so would help to save manpower while providing security to customers.

Regarding claim 4: It is notoriously well known that in gaming area of casino, cameras are located in a position above multiple gaming machines and therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of the combination to provide overhead camera in a gaming area of casinos to cover multiple locations. Doing so would help to save cost.

Conclusion

5. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a. Sengupta et al (US 6,359,647) discloses an automated camera handoff system for figure tracking in a multiple camera system.

b. Bern (US 5,990,938) discloses a showcase security system.

c. Rowe (US 2003/0109308 A1) discloses a method and apparatus for graphically portraying gaming environment and information regarding components thereof.

d. Green (US 6,908,385) discloses a casino video security system.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nhon T. Diep whose telephone number is 571-272-7328. The examiner can normally be reached on m-f.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mehrdad Dastouri can be reached on 571-272-7418. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

N.D. 11/24/08

NHON DIEP
PRIMARY EXAMINER